<u>Remarks</u>

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10-12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, and 31 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,262,871 (Wilder et al.) "Wilder". Claim 1, as amended, describes the photodetector array simultaneously providing signals representing a frame with one or more windows having pixels, and two of such windows are capable of overlapping in the frame. Wilder does not describe windows capable of overlapping in any frame. Wilder describes a sensor (10) in which at any one time the whole array or only particular areas of array may be selected for readout at different resolutions by driving row and column decoders (12, 14) to determine which pixels and how may are to be read out (see FIG. 1, column 4, line 68, to column 5, line 2, and column 5, lines 14-22). It is submitted that in order to output overlapping areas such areas must share some pixels. However, this cannot be achieved at any one time simultaneously from sensor (10), since it would require two different reads of the sensor, and as a result the overlapping areas would be read out from the sensor at different times. Thus, Claim 1 along with its dependent Claims 3, 6, 8, 10-12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, and 25 cannot be anticipated by Wilder, and withdrawal of the rejection of these Claims is requested.

Claim 28, as amended, cannot be anticipated by Wilder where there is no higher resolution window in Wilder imaged simultaneously with any overlapped lower resolution window. As the Examiner stated on page 2 of the Office Action dated April 25, 2005, "Wilder design allows multiple regions at different times". As such, Wilder lacks each and every element of Claim 28. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 28, and of its dependent Claims 29 and 31 is requested.

Claims 7, 13, 19, 22 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder. Claims 7, 13, and 19 depend on Claim 1. As stated above, reading out multiple overlapping regions in Wilder's design would have to occur at different times, since such multiple regions would have to share in part the same pixels, and the same pixels cannot be readout simultaneously. Imaging regions at different times risks destructive interference between such regions, and thus such overlapping could lose image data. Accordingly, Wilder teaches away from overlapping multiple regions of interest. Moreover, in each reading cycle of the sensor, Wilder can select "to read out the pixel signals from pixels in different portions of the array " (see column 3, lines 12-14, and last three lines of Abstract). This again teaches away from overlapping regions in Wilder, since selecting different portions of the array precludes overlapping of such portions, which must share some pixels in common. Claim 22 has been amended to describe forming one

or more high-resolution windows which are capable of overlapping each other and overlapping one or more low-resolution windows in the frame in which the overlapping windows are simultaneously provided in the frame. For similar reasons expressed above, Claim 22 is not described or suggested by Wilder. Thus, Claims 1 and 22 along with their respective dependent Claims 7, 13, 19, and 23 are patentable over Wilder, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 7, 13, 19, 22 and 23 is requested.

Claims 5 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,241 (Yoshimura et. al.) "Yoshimura". Claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,095,212 (Kimata). Claim 15 was rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,236,871 (Fossum et al.) "Fossum". Claim 18 was rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,216,484 (Chao et al.) "Chao". Claims 5, 9, 14, 15, and 18 depend on Claim 1, which for reasons argued above is patentable over Wilder. Yoshimura, Kimata, Fossum, and Chao do not deal with imaging windows which are capable of overlapping. None of these references, Yoshimura, Kimata, Fossum, or Chao, either alone, or in combination with Wilder teach windows capable of overlapping of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 5, 9, 14, 15, and 18 are patentable over the patents relied upon by the Examiner, and withdrawal of their rejections is requested.

Claims 26, 27, and 29 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wilder in view of Fossum. Claims 26, 27, and 29 depend on base Claims 1, 22, and 28 respectively, which are patentable over Wilder for reasons argued earlier. Fossum does not provide that which is absent in Wilder. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 26, 27, and 29 are thus requested.

Claims 32-35 have been added to the Application. Claim 33 describes a video imaging apparatus having a detector array to simultaneously output one or more windows in which two or more are capable of overlapping. Claims 33-35 are dependent on Claim 32. Since none of the references relied upon by the Examiner describe or suggest such simultaneous output of one or more windows, Claims 32-35 are patentable over such references.

It is believed that the Application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 25 , 2005

Kenneth J. LuKacher
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 38,539

South Winton Court
3136 Winton Road South, Suite 204
Rochester, New York 14623
Telephone: (585) 424-2670
Facsimile: (585) 424-6196